

Remarks

Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of December 13, 2007 are respectfully contended in view of the following remarks and the application as amended. The present invention relates generally to composite wrap materials for use as a protective covering in a variety of applications, and methods of making the composite wrap materials. More particularly, the invention relates to composite wrap materials used for packaging paper products.

In the interest of enhancing the prosecution of the application and in order to afford a prompt allowance of the case, new claims 43-59 have been added by this Amendment and Response.

Claims 25, 26, 28-35 and 37-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art in view of Wittosch et al. and further in view of Finestone et al.

Note that there is no teaching or suggestion in the references, alone or in combination, of a wrapped ream of paper as disclosed and presently claimed, wherein the inner surfaces of either the first layer of paper or the second layer of polymer film material are printed before lamination.

The Examiner's attention is directed to Wittosch et al. at column 3, lines 63-67, as follows: *"In other applications, the coating may be applied to the opposite side of a clay coated substrate and used as a label, where the clay coated side provides a printable surface and the invention coating provides barrier characteristics to the resulting container."* (emphasis added) As taught in Wittosch et al., printing on the surface of a formed laminate is the conventional approach in the art. Indeed, Applicants have proceeded contrary to the teachings of the prior art in their invention as disclosed and presently claimed.

The admitted prior art similarly provides no teaching or suggestion of Applicants' presently claimed invention; furthermore, Finestone et al. at column 2, lines 15-18 states the following: *"B. The paper facing of the laminate sheeting has a high affinity for standard printing inks, so that the products made therefrom can readily be printed and colored."* (emphasis added) This is yet another example of the state of the prior art, in which printing

follows lamination; Applicants respectfully reiterate that they have proceeded contrary to the state of the art in their invention as disclosed and presently claimed. Thus, the above rejections are overcome.

It is respectfully contended that the solicited claims define patentable subject matter. Reconsideration and reversal of the rejections expressed in the Office Action of December 13, 2007 are respectfully submitted. The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned if any questions arise during the course of reconsideration of this matter.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 9, 2008

/Richard A. Paikoff/
Richard A. Paikoff
Reg. No. 34,892
Duane Morris LLP
30 South 17th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103-4196
Telephone: 215-979-1853